DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 305 RC 014 483

AUTHOR Cook, Annabel Kirschner
TITLE Hispanics in the Pacific Northwest.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 33p.; An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meetings (Lexington, Kentucky, August 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Age; Census Figures; *Community Characteristics; Comparative Analysis; *Demography; Employment Level; Family Characteristics; Family Structure; Females; *Hispanic Americans; Labor Force; Place of Residence; Population Distribution; Population Growth; Poverty; *Rural Urban Differences; *Whites
IDENTIFIERS *Diversity (Groups); *Pacific Northwest

ABSTRACT

Sources of diversity in the Pacific Northwest's Spanish origin population, up 79.7% since 1970, was the subject of research based on 1980 Census data. Census information for Whites and Hispanics from metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties with 400 or more persons of Spanish origin was compared on the basis of age, family/household structure, employment/unemployment status, educational level, and poverty level. Among area Hispanics, 42.3% were under 18, compared to 27.2% of area Whites. Non-family households were less common for Hispanics, of whom 56% were married compared to 41.5% of Whites. Single women headed 11.9% of Hispanic families but only 7.8% of White families. In the labor force, male Hispanics had much higher participation rates than White males in all types of counties. Contrary to previous findings, Hispanic women also had high participation rates. Nevertheless, standard patterns of high Hispanic unemployment prevailed in the area, as did established patterns of Hispanic education and poverty levels. Lower education and higher poverty rates occurred in nonmetropolitan and highly agricultural areas for both Hispanics and Whites, but the differences were markedly greater for Hispanics. Research is needed in several areas, including female labor force participation and the processes which create a disadvantaged population. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED237305

HISPANICS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

by

Annabel Kirschner Cook
Department of Rural Sociology
Washington State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Annabel K. Cook
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC014483

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meetings in Lexington, Kentucky in August, 1983.

HISPANICS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Abstract

Using 1980 Census data, this research analyzes differences in the Pacific Northwest's Spanish Origin population by age, household/family structure, labor force participation, education and poverty status. Comparisons are made with the White population to see if there are greater differences by county of residence. Contrary to findings from other studies, Hispanic women are more likely to be in the labor force when compared to White women. However, on variables indicating disadvantaged status, Pacific Northwest Hispanics follow patterns set in other parts of the country. In addition, there are generally greater differences by county of residence for the Hispanic population than for the White population.

HISPANICS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Introduction

Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States are a large and rapidly growing minority, increasing by approximately 61 percent in the last decade. The Hispanic[1] population grew even faster in the Pacific Northwest (Oregon, Idaho, and Washington) and is already the area's largest minority. In some nonmetropolitan counties persons of Spanish Origin constitute more than 15 percent of the counties' populations.

Yet as Maldonado (1977) points out, much of the research on this minority has been focused in the Southwest, and on the Mexican Origin population and may not be generalizable to other areas of the country because of the diversity between and within the various Spanish Origin groups. There is diversity between the broad groups of the Spanish Origin population because of their different points of origin before immigration to the United States and their location in the United States. But, in addition, there is diversity within the Mexican American population on such factors as time of arrival and thus length of residence in the United States, urban/rural residence, differential integration into the dominant society, and migration to other parts of the country (Tienda, 1981; Pachon and Moore, 1981; Durant and Knowlton, 1978; Moore, 1976).

Using 1980 Census data this research will explore sources of diversity in the Spanish Origin population in the Pacific Northwest, which has received relatively little attention.[2] In particular, variation by metropolitan and nonmetropolitan residence and sources of variation within the nonmetropolitan Spanish Origin population will be considered. Comparisons will be made with the White population to examine if place of residence is a more important source of variation for persons of Spanish Origin. These findings will also

be compared with past research and implications of these findings for future research will be discussed.

The 1980 Census and the Spanish Origin Population

The 1980 Census was the first time that a question on Spanish Origin or descent was asked of everyone.[3] In contrast, data on the Spanish Origin population from the 1970 Census came from a variety of sources. There was a question on Spanish Origin on that census, but it was asked of only 5 percent of the population and was generally not used to identify the Spanish Origin population. Instead, persons were classified by birth, parentage, language and/or surname depending on their state of residence (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1981b). This change in the method of counting the Spanish Origin population as well as an changes in question design and efforts to reduce the undercount of minorities through improved publicity and community relations means that data for this group are not completely comparable over time (Haub, 1981, U.S. Bureau of the Census 1982b).[4]

Although the 1980 Census provides better, more accurate information on Hispanics, some of the past problems remain. The census gives information only on the resident population in an area. No information is given on the migrant labor force, an important but periodic subgroup in counties which depend on large number of migrant workers to harvest crops. Tienda (1981) points out that census data on the Spanish Origin population in nonmetropolitan counties underestimates their numbers because the census undercounts illegal aliens and mobile families, and it excludes many who live in metropolitan areas, but spend much of their time working in nonmetropolitan areas. In spite of these problems, the large amount of

information provided by the census makes it a basic source for analysis of the Spanish Origin population.

Some of the 61 percent increase in the nation's Hispanic population was due to the improvements and changes in counting persons of Spanish Origin mentioned above, but some was also due to the higher fertility of the Spanish Origin population, and some to substantial immigration from Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Central and South America (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1982b).

The Spanish Origin population in the Pacific Northwest grew even faster than the nation's, increasing by 79.7 percent. The greatest percent change in this population occurred in Idaho where the number of Hispanics nearly doubled, increasing by 98.2 percent. The number of Hispanics in Oregon grew quite rapidly, too, increasing by 90.4 percent. Although Washington's Hispanic population grew only slightly faster than the nation's, by 69.7 percent, the largest number of Northwest Hispanics (48,282) were added to that state.

Some of the difference in growth in the Spanish Origin population between the Pacific Northwest and the nation as a whole is due to a dispersion of the Mexican Origin population out of the Southwest to both the Midwest[5] and the Pacific Northwest. There was evidence of dispersion of the Mexican Origin population from 1970 Census data when Briggs, et al., (1977) noted that in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington a larger percent of the Spanish Origin population was foreign born and that a lower percent of resident Hispanics had been born in those states than was the case for Southwestern states. By 1980 the Mexican Origin population was less concentrated in the Southwest than in 1970, when 87 percent lived in

California, Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, and Colorado compared to 83 percent in 1980 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1982b).

One factor in the migration of Hispanics to Washington, Oregon, and Idaho may be the substantial expansion of irrigated farmland which has occurred in the area. Between 1969 and 1978, irrigated farmland increased by 29.2 percent compared to a 5.9 percent increase in all farmland (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1981a). Irrigation produces more labor intensive crops with a move from rangeland or dryland wheat farming to orchards, asparagus, and melons and thus an increase in demand for farm labor. In addition, there is generally more food processing involved in the new crops and there may be an increasing need for unskilled labor to maintain and inspect the irrigation pipes and system.

But dispersion out of the Southwest is only one source of growth in the Pacific Northwest's Spanish Origin population. As Table 1 shows, slightly over one quarter of the area's Hispanics chose the "Other Spanish" category on the 1980 Census, an indication that the area is probably also receiving immigrants from Central and South America. In comparison only 15.4 percent of the Hispanics in the Southwest and 20.9 percent nationally chose this category.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Expectations and Source of Data

As was indicated earlier, the diversity of this group has been stressed by many researchers. One source of diversity in the Northwest's Spanish Origin population may be due to metropolitan/nonmetropolitan residence. Although there has been a convergence between metropolitan/nonmetropolitan

populations, this still remains a differentiating factor for the general population (Ford, 1978; Larson, 1978; Willits, et al., 1982). In addition, researchers on the Hispanic population in other areas have noted that rural Hispanics have a more traditional family lifestyle, higher rates of poverty, lower levels of education, and lower rates of female labor force participation (Tienda, 1981; Maldonado, 1978; Kuvelesky, et al., 1982).

Others have commented on the fact that the Hispanic population is not a rural minority, but is predominantly located in metropolitan areas. This is also true in the Pacific Northwest where in 1980, 64 percent lived in metropolitan counties. But Hispanics are less likely to reside in metropolitan areas than the general population which is 68 percent metropolitan; and they are less metropolitan than they were in 1970 when 66 percent lived in metropolitan areas. Obviously, the problems covered earlier with changing definitions and methods of counting the Spanish Origin population apply here. It is impossible to say whether this decline in the percent of the Hispanic population in metropolitan areas is due to those changes or if the number of nonmetropolitan Hispanics really did grow faster than the number in metropolitan areas. But in the Pacific Northwest, at least, the differences between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan Hispanics are worthy of further investigation, and this paper will compare the percent of the Northwest Hispanic population by metropolitan-nonmetropolitan residence on several variables: under 18, in different household/family structures, employed/unemployed, with at least a high school education, and below the poverty level.

As others have observed, there is a great deal of variation among nonmetropolitan counties (Brown and Beale, 1981; Gilford, et al., 1981; Dillman and Hobbs, 1982). One source of nonmetropolitan county level variation is the importance of agriculture. In many nonmetropolitan counties

other forms of employment such as manufacturing or services predominate. It was the primarily agricultural, nonmetropolitan counties which were left out of the rural-urban turnaround of the last decade (Beale and Brown, 1981).

Variation in nonmetropolitan counties by predominance of agriculture may be particularly important for Hispanics since rural Hispanics have often been tied to farm labor. One possible source of growth in the Northwest's Hispanic population is migrant farm workers from the Southwest who "settle out" in the area. In addition, Hispanics in the area's nonmetropolitan counties where agriculture is important are more likely to have periodic contact with migrant laborers from the Southwest who come to harvest the crops, whether or not the resident population is working on farms.

For these reasons, this paper will also examine differences in the nonmetropolitan Hispanic population by importance of agriculture in the county. Counties are classified by the percent of the labor force in farming, forestry, and fishing occupations (data are not yet available from the 1980 Census on the labor force in just agriculture). In the Pacific Northwest, nonmetropolitan counties range from just 2.4 percent of the labor force involved in these occupations up to 34.1 percent. Counties where less than 12 percent of the labor force was in these occupations on the 1980 Census have been classified as low agricultural counties, those with 12 percent or more as high agricultural counties.[6]

It is expected that Hispanics in the high agricultural counties will be even more "rural" than those in the low agricultural counties. That is that they will have more traditional household/family structures, higher rates of poverty and unemployment and lower levels of education.

Many of the differences between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan Hispanics also apply to the general population (Ford, 1978). Differences

between the Hispanic and White population in metropolitan/nonmetropolitan and low vs. high agricultural counties will be compared to see if county of residence is a more or less important factor for introducing variation into the Hispanic population when compared to the White population in those counties. To make these comparisons, the absolute difference in percents between metropolitan-nonmetropolitan and low-high agricultural counties will be examined.

This research relies on available printed data from the 1980 Census and analyzes variation in the resident Spanish Origin population in the Pacific Northwest in counties with 400 or more persons in this group.[7] As Table 2 shows, 94.7 percent of the Spanish Origin population live in counties with a Spanish Origin population of 400 or more. All of the metropolitan, and 86.2 percent of the nonmetropolitan populations are included. A somewhat smaller proportion of the White population live in counties with at least 400 Hispanics -- 87.6 percent overall. This includes 98.6 percent of the White population in metropolitan counties and 65.7 percent in nonmetropolitan counties.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Findings

Age

Many have remarked on the youth of the Spanish Origin population compared to the White population primarily because of higher birth rates and the immigration of large numbers of young adults (Pachon and Moore, 1981; Estrada, 1978; Davis, et al., 1983). As Table 3 shows, 42.3 percent of the Hispanic population is under 18 compared to only 27.2 percent of the White

population. For both Whites and Hispanics, the nonmetropolitan population is younger than the metropolitan population with the absolute difference in percent between the two types of counties being about the same. There is little difference in the percent of the Spanish Origin population under 18 by type of nonmetropolitan county with the percent being somewhat higher for low agricultural counties. This is contrary to what might be expected since children are often seen as more of an economic asset when they can help with farmwork, and contrary to the trend for the White population.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Family Structure

There is some debate on just how traditional Hispanic family patterns are compared to White family patterns. Miller (1979) thinks that a characterization of the Hispanic family as very traditional comes from uncritical extrapolations of studies done in small, rural, agricultural areas. Both he and Bean and Alvirez (1976) stress the heterogeneity of Hispanic family patterns. In terms of marital stability, Eberstein and Frisbie (1976) have found that in the Southwest rates for Mexican Americans were lower than those for Anglos or Blacks. However, Davis, et al., (1983) noted that nationally single parent families are more common among the Spanish Origin population than the population in general, but not as common as for blacks.

In this research, Whites and Hispanics are compared on different types of household and family patterns. Looking first at the percent of households which are nonfamily households,[8] the second part of Table 3 shows that these are more common for Whites than Hispanics. For both groups, nonfamily households are more typical of metropolitan than nonmetropolitan and low than

high agricultural counties. Looking at the absolute difference in percent, it is also clear that there is more of a difference for Hispanics than for Whites.

The most common family households are married couples with or without children and single parent families. Fifty-six percent of all Hispanic families are married couples with children under 18 compared to only 41.5 percent of all White families. As would be expected, these families are more common in nonmetropolitan and high agricultural counties.

Since Hispanic households are less likely to be nonfamily households and Hispanic families are more likely to be composed of married couples with children under 18 when compared with Whites one might conclude that in the Northwest, the Hispanic family structure is indeed more traditional and less subject to the trends toward divorce and single parenthood which have become increasingly common. However, the next part of Table 3 shows that this is not the case. Hispanic families are also more likely than White families to be headed by a single female (no husband present) with children under 18 -- 11.9 percent compared to 7.8 percent.

The final part of Table 3 helps explain why Hispanic living arrangements can be characterized by two seemingly different household types. Compared to White families, Hispanic families are much less likely to be married couples without children under 18. The fact that such a large percent of the Spanish Origin population is under 18 means that a smaller percent of Hispanic married couples have no children and a smaller percent of households are nonfamily households. On the other hand, family households, with children under 18, whether they are headed by a married couple or a single female are much more common for the Spanish Origin population.

As was noted above other researchers have stressed the diversity in the Hispanic family. The data here for the Northwest Hispanics population

support this at least in terms of diversity by county type when compared to the White population. With one exception, the absolute difference in percent for all family and household types is greater (usually considerably greater) for the Hispanic population when compared to the White population by both metropolitan/nonmetropolitan and low/high agricultural counties. Only the absolute difference in percent for Hispanic and White female headed families in metropolitan compared to nonmetropolitan areas is about the same.

Labor Force Participation

Findings from past studies comparing the likelihood of White and Hispanic males participating in the labor force are not entirely consistent.[9] Using 1970 Census data for the male Spanish surname population, Briggs, et al., (1977), reported lower rates of labor force participation when compared to male Whites in Texas and California. Pachon and Moore (1981) using a 1978 Bureau of Labor Statistics survey reported very similar rates of labor force participation for the Mexican Origin population compared to the general population. And Tienda (1981) reported higher participation rates for Spanish Origin men when compared to the total population using data from a national level 1978 Current Population Report.

As Table 4 shows, male Hispanics in the Pacific Northwest have considerably higher rates of labor force participation than do Whites in all types of counties. There is very little difference in labor force participation for Hispanics by metropolitan/nonmetropolitan county type, while Whites are less likely to participate in the labor force in nonmetropolitan counties. Both Whites and Hispanics are more likely to work in high agricultural when compared to low agricultural counties, but the absolute difference in percent is higher for Hispanics.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

There is more consensus in past research on female Hispanic labor force participation when compared to other females. Research has found that Hispanic females are less likely to be in the labor force than are White or Black females (Tienda, 1981; Rochin, 1974; Briggs, et al., 1977). This is not the case in the Pacific Northwest. As Table 4 shows, 56.4 percent of the Hispanic females were in the labor force compared to 50.7 percent of the White females in 1980. Hispanic females were more likely to be in the labor force compared to White females by all types of geographic area. In fact, female Hispanics in high agricultural counties had the lowest labor force participation rates for that group. But, these rates were still higher than the labor force participation rates for White females in metropolitan counties -- the area where White females were most likely to be in the labor force.

There is general agreement in past research on the likelihood of being unemployed. Hispanics are more likely to be unemployed than are Whites, and Hispanic females are more likely to be unemployed than are Hispanic males (Tienda, 1981, Briggs, et al., 1977; Pachon and Moore, 1981). Both of these patterns remain true in the Pacific Northwest. Hispanic males have somewhat higher unemployment rates in all areas and in high agricultural counties they have substantially higher unemployment rates than those for White males. The unemployment rates for Hispanic females are higher than for Hispanic males in all areas, and are substantially higher than those for White females. In addition, there is more of a difference in unemployment by area for Hispanic females than for Whites or Hispanic males.

Education and Poverty

Many researchers have noted very low levels of education for the Spanish Origin population. This coupled with their greater likelihood of being unemployed, and when employed, working in poorly paid occupations, and the proportionately larger number of children all help to contribute to the high levels of poverty among Hispanics. In addition, as Poston and Alvirez (1973) and Poston, et al., (1976) have noted that there is a "cost" to being a Mexican American worker. In both 1960 and 1970, Mexican American males earned less than Anglos when differences in education and occupation were controlled. Hispanics in rural areas have even lower levels of education and higher rates of poverty than do those in urban areas (Pachon and Moore, 1981; Maldonado, 1978; Durant and Knowlton, 1978; Rochin, 1974; Tienda, 1981; Poston and Alvirez, 1973).

These patterns also characterize the Spanish Origin population in the Pacific Northwest. As Table 5 demonstrates, 77.5 percent of the White population 25 and older has a high school education or more, compared to only 51.2 percent of the Spanish Origin population. Both Whites and Hispanics in metropolitan areas are better educated than their counterparts in nonmetropolitan areas and the same is true comparing low vs. high agricultural counties. But the absolute difference in percent is much greater for Hispanics than for Whites. Only 38.1 percent of the nonmetropolitan Hispanics 25 and older and only 28.5 percent of those in high agricultural counties have at least a high school education.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

Hispanics are two and one-half times more likely to live below the poverty level than are Whites (22.5 percent compared to 9.2 percent). Once

again higher rates of poverty are more characteristic of nonmetropolitan and high agricultural counties for both Whites and Hispanics. But, as with education, there is a much greater difference in rates of poverty by county type for Hispanics than for Whites.

Summary and Conclusion

Throughout, this paper has examined the part county of residence plays as a basis for diversity in the Hispanic population. In general, these data indicate that on the variables examined here, there is more of a difference between the Hispanic population by residence in metropolitan/nonmetropolitan counties, and within nonmetropolitan counties in low and high agricultural counties than is the case for White population. On the different variables related to household and family structure and for education and poverty, the absolute percent differences by county type were substantially larger in all but one instance for the Spanish Origin population. Only for the variables on percent of the population under 18 and labor force participation was there no clear trend.

This does not mean that Hispanics and Whites are close to parity in the metropolitan areas of the Northwest. On the variables that indicate a disadvantaged status, Northwest Hispanics follow patterns set in other parts of the country. They have higher rates of unemployment, they have less education, and they are much more likely to be poor than are members of the White population. All of these problems are more common in nonmetropolitan areas, particularly in high agricultural counties than in metropolitan areas. Consequently, metropolitan Hispanics are disadvantaged vis-a-vis the White population, but nonmetropolitan Hispanics, particularly those living in high agricultural counties, are very disadvantaged.

Hispanic women in particular are disadvantaged by single parenthood and by unemployment. Although female headed families with children under 18 are more common in metropolitan areas for both Whites and Hispanics, the likelihood of heading such a family is more common for female Hispanics. In fact, female Hispanics in high agricultural counties are more likely to head such families than are White women in metropolitan counties. The fact that Northwest Hispanic women are more likely to be in the labor force than White women in contrast to past studies for the Southwest and the nation may be an attempt to cope with single parenthood.[10] These labor force participation rates are so high that Hispanic women in high agricultural counties are also more likely to be in the labor force than White metropolitan women. However, they have the highest unemployment rates of any group and are two and one-half times more likely to be unemployed than White women in metropolitan counties.

Some have hypothesized that the dispersion of Hispanics represents a movement away from areas of low opportunity and high discrimination to areas where upward mobility is easier to achieve (Briggs, 1977). What seems more likely is that many of the processes discussed by Tienda (1981) which have created a disadvantaged population in the Southwest (including the concentration of the population in poverty areas, the influx of low-skilled workers, racism and institutional discrimination) are also operating in the Pacific Northwest.

This is only one area where more research is needed. An obvious area for future research are the differences in female labor force participation. Frequency of single parenthood could be one explanation. Or, are the women who have migrated into the area in recent years more likely to be working than the resident population? This would suggest that the migrant stream to

the area is particularly selective of persons looking for work and moving for work related reasons. If so, this would not be a surprising finding, given past research on labor force migration, but it is certainly an area that needs to be better researched. In addition, perhaps differences in labor force participation are related to different occupational opportunities. Cooney and Ortiz (1983) have suggested differences in female labor force participation between foreign-born Puerto Ricans and Mexicans may be due to their residence in different labor market areas.

Further investigation is needed to help explain why there are greater differences among the Hispanic population by county of residence than among the White population. It is possible that Hispanics are less influenced by the trends toward convergence between rural and urban America. For example, given their low educational levels, particularly in nonmetropolitan and high agricultural counties, they may have difficulty moving into the more urban, manufacturing and service jobs as these increase in those counties. Another possibility is that variation in racial identification by county type impedes Hispanic integration into the dominant group. Other research has shown that nonmetropolitan Hispanics in Washington are more likely to identify as non-White (Cook, 1982).

In general, more research is needed on the causes of variation in racial identification by different Spanish Origin groups (such as points of origin abroad, recency of arrival in the United States, rural-urban residence) and the consequences of this variation for the different groups (slower or faster social mobility, more or less conflict with the dominant society).

This gets into the issue of whether or not the Spanish Origin population is assimilating into the dominant White society. Two recent studies have come up with very different views on this issue. A national study of the different

Spanish Origin groups using 1970 census data concluded that although Spanish Americans were not yet as well off as the White population, within a generation or two "they will be almost indistinguishable from the general U.S. population" (Jaffe, et al., 1980:22). On the other hand, from an examination of data on Mexican Americans, others have found that succeeding generations of this group are trapped in low-paying, dead-end jobs. They concluded:

> It is unpleasant to state that Mexican Americans constitute disproportionate numbers of America's underclass, but nothing useful is gained by pretending . . . that the traditional ladders of economic opportunity of the past continue to work in mystic ways (Pachon and Moore, 1981:119-120).

The data from the 1980 Census, linked with that from preceding Censuses and surveys, provides a rich source of information with which to address these and other research issues. Given the diversity within the Spanish Origin population, it is important that these sources be utilized to better understand the nation's second largest minority.

Footnotes

[1]In this paper, the terms "Spanish Origin population" and "Hispanics" will be used interchangeably.

[2]See Slatta (1976, 1979) and Cook (1982) for initial research in Oregon and Washington.

[3]The questions asked, "Is this person of Spanish/Hispanic Origin or descent?" Since most persons would not be Hispanic the first option was, "No, (not Spanish/Hispanic)." The remaining options classify the Spanish Origin population as: 1) Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano; 2) Puerto Rican; 3) Cuban; 4) Other Spanish/Hispanic which includes persons from Spain, the Dominican Republic, Central or South America (except Brazil) and nonspecific designations such as "Spanish surnamed" or "Spanish speaking."

[4]The question on Spanish Origin was separate from another question on race. There was also a change in the method of tabulating persons who wrote in a response indicating Hispanic background in the "other" category for race. In 1970, the Census Bureau reclassified such persons as White, a practice criticized by the Bureau's Hispanic Advisory Committee. In 1980, these persons were left in the "other" category, and it is estimated that the number of Whites nationally could be five million persons below what would have been expected in 1980 if the 1970 procedure had been kept (Robey, 1981).

[5]Estrada (1978) has noted the substantial recent migration of Hispanics to the Midwest and compared the demographic characteristics of these with Southwest Hispanics.

[6]Twelve percent was used as the division point after sorting the 39 nonmetropolitan counties from low to high on this variable. There was a gap of 2.3 percentage points (i.e., between 10.3 and 12.7 percent) between the 19th and 20th counties where there was no other clear break in the continuum except at the uppermost extreme. This gap separated the number of counties as evenly as possible.

[7]The Census Bureau does not provide printed information on the minority populations in counties with fewer than 400 persons in a minority group.

[8]Nonfamily households are those with only one person or where two or more persons not related by birth, marriage, or adoption share a housing unit. Family households are composed of two or more persons who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption sharing a housing unit.

[9]Studies on the position of Hispanics within the labor force, however, are consistent. They are much more likely to work in low skilled, poorly paid occupations (Rochin, 1974; Maldonado, 1982; Tienda, 1981; Briggs, et al., 1977).

[10]Other research has shown that Mexican and Cuban women who were household heads were more likely to be in the labor force than other women, but that there was no such relationship for Puerto Rican women (Cooney and Ortiz, 1983; Guhleman, et al., 1981).

References

Briggs, Vernon M., Jr., Walter Fogel, and Fred H. Schmidt. 1977. The Chicano Worker. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Brown, David L., and Calvin L. Beale. 1981. "Diversity in Post-1970 Population Trends." Pp. 27-71 in Amos H. Hawley and Sara Mills Mazie (eds.), Nonmetropolitan America in Transition. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.

Cook, Annabel Kirschner. 1981. "Minorities in Washington." Census Notes 2. (May).

_____. 1982. "Hispanics in Washington." Census Notes 10. (May).

Cooney, Rosemary Santana and Vilma Ortiz. 1983. "Nativity, National Origin, and Hispanic Female Participation in the Labor Force." Social Science Quarterly. 64 (September):510-523.

Davis, Cary, Carl Haub and JoAnne Willette. 1983. "U.S. Hispanics: Changing the Face of America." Population Bulletin. 38 (June):3-44.

Dillman, Don A., and Daryl J. Hobbs. 1982. "Research for the Rural United States." Pp. 1-9 in Don A. Dillman and Daryl J. Hobbs (eds.), Rural Society in the U.S.: Issues for the 1980s. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Durant, Thomas J., Jr., and Clark S. Knowlton. 1978. "Rural Ethnic Minorities: Adaptive Response to Inequality." Pp. 145-167 in Thomas R. Ford (ed.), Rural U.S.A.: Persistence and Change. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Eberstein, Issac W., and W. Parker Frisbie. 1976. "Differences in Marital Instability Among Mexican Americans." Social Problems. 23 (Spring):609-621.

Estrada, Leobardo F. 1978. "A Demographic Comparison of the Mexican Origin Population in the Midwest and Southwest." Aztlan. 7 (2):203-234.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph P., and Lourdes Travieso Parker. 1981. "Hispanic Americans in the Eastern United States." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Services. 454 (March):98-110.

Ford, Thomas R.. 1978. Rural U.S.A.: Persistence and Change. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Gilford, Dorothy M., Glenn L. Nelson, and Linda Ingram. 1981. Rural America in Passage: Statistics for Policy. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Guhleman, Patricia A., Marta Tienda, and Marion Bowman. 1981. "An Employment and Earnings Profile of Hispanic Origin Workers in the U.S.," in Marta Tienda, principal investigator, Hispanic Origin Workers in the U.S. Labor Market: Comparative Analyses of Employment and Earnings. Final report to the U.S. Department of Labor (October):pp. 1-91.

Haub, Carl. 1981. "The U.S. Hispanic Population: A Question of Definition." Intercom. (November/December):8-10.

Kuvelesky, William P., Clark S. Knowlton, Thomas J. Durant, Jr., and William C. Payne, Jr. 1982. "Minorities." Pp. 103-123 in Don A. Dillman and Darvl J. Hobbs (eds.), Rural Society in the U.S.: Issues for the 1980s. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Larson, Olaf F. 1978. "Values and Beliefs of Rural People." Pp. 91-112 in Thomas R.Ford (ed.), Rural U.S.A.: Persistence and Change. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Maldonado, Lionel A. 1978. The Social Ecology of Chicanos in Utah. Iowa City, Iowa: The University of Iowa.

_____. 1982. "Mexican-Americans: The Emergence of a Minority." Pp. 168-195 in Anthony Gary Dworkin and Rosalind J. Dworkin (eds.), The Minority Report. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Moore, Joan. 1976. Mexican Americans (2nd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Pachon, Harry P., and Joan W. Moore. 1981. "Mexican-Americans." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Services. 454 (March):111-124.

Poston, Dudley L., Jr., and David Alvirez. 1973. "On the Cost of Being a Mexican American Worker." Social Science Quarterly. 53 (March):697-709.

_____, and Marta Tienda. 1976. "Earning Differences Between Anglo and Mexican American Male Workers in 1960 and 1970: Changes in the 'Cost' of Being Mexican American." Social Science Quarterly. 57 (December):618-631.

Robey, Bryant. 1981. "The Numbers News." American Demographics. 3 (February):supplement.

Rochin, Refugio I. 1974. "Economic Deprivation of Chicanos -- Continuing Neglect in the Seventies." Aztlan. 4 (1):85-99.

Slatta, Richard W. 1976. "Chicanos in the Pacific Northwest: An Historical Overview of Oregon's Chicanos." Aztlan. 6 (3):327-340.

_____. 1979. "Chicanos in the Pacific Northwest: A Demographic and Socioeconomic Portrait." Pacific Northwest Quarterly. (October):155-162.

Tienda, Marta. 1981. "The Mexican-American Population." Pp. 502-548 in Amos H. Hawley and Sara Mills Mazie (eds.), Nonmetropolitan America in Transition. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1973. Characteristics of the Population: 1970 Census of Population, Parts 14, 39, and 49. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1981a. Census of Agriculture: 1978, Parts 12, 37, and 47. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1981b. Census of Population and Housing, 1980: Summary Tape File 1 Technical Documentation. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1981c. General Population Characteristics: 1980 Census of Population, Parts 14, 39, and 49. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1982a. Advance Estimates of Social, Economic, and Housing Characteristics: 1980 Census Population, Parts 14, 39, 49. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1982b. Persons of Spanish Origin by State: 1980. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1982c. Statistical Abstract of the U.S. 1982-83. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Willits, Fern K., Robert C. Bealer, and Donald M. Crider. 1982. "Persistence of Rural/Urban Differences." Pp. 69-78 in Don A. Dillman and Daryl J. Hobbs (eds.), Rural Society in the U.S.: Issues for the 1980s. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

TABLE 1. PERCENT OF SPANISH ORIGIN POPULATION CHOOSING DIFFERENT CATEGORIES, PACIFIC NORTHWEST COMPARED TO THE SOUTHWEST AND THE UNITED STATES

	United States	Southwest[1]	Pacific Northwest	Idaho	Oregon	Washington
Mexican	59.8	82.4	69.4	76.9	68.6	67.6
Puerto Rican	13.8	1.4	3.3	1.1	2.7	4.2
Cuban	5.5	0.9	1.1	0.3	1.6	1.0
Other Spanish	20.9	15.4	26.2	21.7	27.1	27.1
(N)	14,608,673	8,787,495	222,478	36,615	65,847	120,016

[1]Includes California, Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, and Colorado.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1982b, 1982c.

TABLE 2. COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF PERSONS IN THE SPANISH ORIGIN AND WHITE POPULATIONS IN COUNTIES WITH MORE THAN 400 PERSONS OF SPANISH ORIGIN TO THE TOTAL POPULATION FOR THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

	Spanish Origin	White
Pacific Northwest		
Total Population	222,478	7,171,421
# in Counties with 400 or more persons of Spanish Origin	210,679	6,285,024
% of Total	94.7	87.6
Metropolitan Counties		
Total Population	142,670	4,783,023
# in Counties with 400 or more persons of Spanish Origin	142,670	4,715,028
% of Total	100.0	98.6
Nonmetropolitan Counties		
Total Population	79,008	2,388,398
# in Counties with 400 or more persons of Spanish Origin	68,009	1,569,996
% of Total	86.2	65.7

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1981c.

TABLE 3A. AGE, HOUSEHOLD/FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE SPANISH ORIGIN AND WHITE POPULATIONS BY COUNTY TYPE IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Age, Household/Family County Type	Population: Spanish Origin %	Spanish Origin Abs. Diff. in %	Population: White %	White Abs. Diff. in %
% of Population Under 18				
All Counties	42.3		27.2	
Metropolitan	41.2	3.7	26.4	3.2
Nonmetropolitan	44.9		29.6	
Low Agricultural	45.3	0.8	28.9	2.5
High Agricultural	44.5		31.4	
(N)	(210,679)		(6,285,024)	
% of Households Which Are Nonfamily Households				
All Counties	23.8		29.4	
Metropolitan	26.1	7.6	30.9	6.2
Nonmetropolitan	18.5		24.7	
Low Agricultural	20.9	5.1	25.3	2.5
High Agricultural	15.8		22.8	
(N)	(54,813)		(2,380,797)	
% of Families Which Are Married Couples With Children Under 18				
All Counties	56.3		41.5	
Metropolitan	54.7	5.1	40.9	2.3
Nonmetropolitan	59.8		43.2	
Low Agricultural	57.6	4.6	42.7	2.2
High Agricultural	62.2		44.9	
(N)	(41,793)		(1,680,956)	

TABLE 3B. AGE, HOUSEHOLD/FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE SPANISH ORIGIN AND WHITE POPULATIONS BY COUNTY TYPE IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Age, Household/Family County Type	Population			
	Spanish Origin		White	
	%	*Abs. Diff. in %*	%	*Abs. Diff. in %*
% of Families Which Are Female Headed[1] With Children Under 18				
All Counties	11.9		7.8	
Metropolitan	12.4	*1.6*	8.7	*1.8*
Nonmetropolitan	10.8		6.9	
Low Agricultural	12.4	*3.4*	7.2	*1.3*
High Agricultural	9.0		5.9	
(N)	(41,793)		(1,680,956)	
% of Families Which are Married Couples Without Children Under 18				
All Counties	22.4		44.1	
Metropolitan	23.6	*3.6*	44.0	*0.4*
Nonmetropolitan	20.0		44.4	
Low Agricultural	22.8	*5.5*	44.5	*0.1*
High Agricultural	17.3		44.4	
(N)	(41,793)		(1,680,956)	

[1]No Husband Present.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1981c.

TABLE 4A. LABOR FORCE AND UNEMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE SPANISH ORIGIN AND WHITE POPULATIONS BY COUNTY TYPE IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Age, Household/Family County Type	Population: Spanish Origin %	*Absolute Difference in %*	Population: White %	*Absolute Difference in %*
% of Population 16 and Over in the Labor Force				
Males				
All Counties	81.6		76.8	
Metropolitan	81.5	*0.3*	77.7	*3.6*
Nonmetropolitan	81.8		74.1	
Low Agricultural	78.7	*6.2*	73.3	*3.5*
High Agricultural	84.9		76.8	
(N)	(71,971)		(2,369,065)	
Females				
All Counties	56.4		50.7	
Metropolitan	57.0	*1.9*	52.1	*5.7*
Nonmetropolitan	55.1		46.4	
Low Agricultural	56.4	*2.9*	46.1	*1.1*
High Agricultural	53.5		47.2	
(N)	(59,815)		(2,493,643)	

TABLE 4B. LABOR FORCE AND UNEMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE SPANISH ORIGIN AND WHITE POPULATIONS BY COUNTY TYPE IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Age, Household/Family County Type	Population: Spanish Origin %	Spanish Origin *Absolute Difference in %*	Population: White %	White *Absolute Difference in %*
% of Labor Force Who Were Unemployed				
Males				
All Counties	8.6		7.3	
Metropolitan	7.6	*3.2*	6.8	*2.1*
Nonmetropolitan	10.8		8.9	
Low Agriculture	11.6	*1.6*	9.6	*2.9*
High Agriculture	10.0		6.7	
(N)	(58,425)		(1,820,618)	
Females				
All Counties	11.2		7.0	
Metropolitan	9.8	*4.8*	6.4	*2.3*
Nonmetropolitan	14.6		8.7	
Low Agriculture	12.5	*4.7*	8.8	*0.4*
High Agriculture	17.2		8.4	
(N)	(33,684)		(1,264,449)	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1982a.

TABLE 5. EDUCATION AND POVERTY CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE SPANISH ORIGIN AND WHITE POPULATIONS BY COUNTY TYPE IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Education, Poverty County Type	Population: Spanish Origin %	Spanish Origin *Absolute Difference in %*	Population: White %	White *Absolute Difference in %*
% of Population 25 and Over With a High School Education or More				
All Counties	51.2		77.5	
Metropolitan	59.8	*21.7*	79.2	*6.7*
Nonmetropolitan	38.1		72.5	
Low Agricultural	46.8	*18.3*	73.3	*3.1*
High Agricultural	28.5		70.2	
(N)	(85,221)		(3,822,266)	
Percent of Population Below Poverty Level				
All Counties	22.5		9.2	
Metropolitan	20.4	*6.6*	8.5	*2.8*
Nonmetropolitan	27.0		11.3	
Low Agricultural	23.9	*6.4*	10.8	*2.1*
High Agricultural	30.3		12.9	
(N)	(210,679)		(6,285,024)	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1982a.